

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/644,534	08/19/2003	Roger W. Geary	378 P002 5975		
75	590 09/22/2004	EXAMINER			
Mr. Marc D. Machtinger, Esq.			HOGE, GARY CHAPMAN		
Law Office of I	Marc D. Machtinger, Ltd.				
Suite 350		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
750 W. Lake C		3611			
Buffalo Grove, IL 60089-2073			DATE MAILED: 09/22/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Application	Application No. Applicant(s)				
		10/644,53	4	GEARY, ROGER W.			
		Examiner		Art Unit	1 4 4 1		
		Gary C Ho		3611	L NUY/		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication a or Reply	appears on the	cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ac	ddress		
THE - External after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION msions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a report of the provisions of the provision	N. 1.136(a). In no eve reply within the statu iod will apply and wil itute, cause the appl	nt, however, may a reply be tim tory minimum of thirty (30) day: I expire SIX (6) MONTHS from loation to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered time the mailing date of this of 0 (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status							
1)[Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
2a)□	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	 ✓ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-7 and 9-41 is/are rejected. ☒ Claim(s) 4 and 8 is/are objected to. ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 						
Applicati	ion Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10)[10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
2) Notic	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate			
3) 🔯 Infor	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/er No(s)/Mail Date 8/19/03.		5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application (PT	O-152)		

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1-3, 5, 9-30 and 34-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Glancy.

Glancy discloses a label assembly comprising a label 2 affixed to a non-opaque bottle 2, the label having a first viewing area 5 comprising an area free of opaque label material, and a second viewing area 4 comprising an area free of opaque label material, a first indicia portion 3 applied to an inward facing side of the label disposed substantially diametrically opposed from the first viewing area 5 about the bottle and viewably aligned with the first viewing area 5, a second indicia portion 3 applied to the inward facing side of the label disposed substantially diametrically opposed from the second viewing area 4 about the bottle and viewably aligned with the second viewing area 4, wherein the first indicia portion is viewable through the first viewing area 5 when a level of substantially opaque fluid within the bottle is below the first indicia portion and the first viewing area 5, and wherein the second indicia portion is viewable through the second viewing area 4 when a level of substantially opaque fluid within the bottle is below the second indicia portion and the second viewing area 4.

Regarding claims 9 and 10, Glancy discloses filling the container with an opaque fluid.

Regarding claims 15 and 16, see column 4, lines 14-16.

Regarding claims 17-33, 40 and 41, it has been held that patentable novelty cannot be principally predicated on mere printed matter and arrangements thereof, but must reside basically in physical structure. See *In re Montgomery*, 102 USPQ 248.

Regarding claims 36-39, these limitations are merely a statement of intended use of the container and do not further limit the claimed label. However, it appears that Glancy does anticipate these limitations.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glancy in view of Swenson.

Glancy discloses the invention substantially as claimed, as set forth above. However, the label disclosed by Glancy is made in one piece. Swenson teaches that it was known in the art to make a label in two pieces. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the label disclosed by Glancy in two pieces, as taught by Swenson, in order to allow more of the liquid in the bottle to be visible to consumers.

5. Claims 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glancy in view of Taub.

Glancy discloses the invention substantially as claimed, as set forth above. However,
Glancy discloses only a single container. Taub teaches that it was known in the art to provide a

plurality of bottles in a package. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to put a plurality of the bottles disclosed by Glancy in a package, as taught by Taub, in order to ship and display the product.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 4 and 8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Į.

- 7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- 8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gary C Hoge whose telephone number is (703) 308-3422. The examiner can normally be reached on 5-4-9.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lesley Morris can be reached on (703) 308-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

Art Unit: 3611

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3611

gch